REMARKS

This amendment is responsive to the Office Action of March 13, 2003. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

The Office Action

Claims 1-4, 8-10, 14, 16-20, and 25 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Boles et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,163,377).

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-10, and 15-17 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Chen (U.S. Patent No. Des. 432,516).

Claims 1-4, 8-10, and 15-17 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Booty, Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 5,940,350).

Claims 1-25 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Skop, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,270,540) in view of King et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,296,426).

The Claims of the Present Application Distinguish Over the Cited References

Claim 1 recites a plurality of case supporting elements, which extend over and radially outwardly from the case.

Boles et al. (Boles) discloses a case 10 having a plurality of case supporting elements 30 extending from the case 10. However, Boles fails to disclose the case supporting elements 30 extending over the case 10 and radially outwardly from the case

10, as recited in claim 1. Therefore, claim 1, along with claims 2-25 which depend therefrom, are patentable over Boles.

Chen discloses a shower radio having a clock. A plurality of case supporting elements (e.g., three case supporting elements) extend from a side of a case, which houses the radio and clock. Although Chen discloses case supporting elements extending from a side of a case, the reference fails to disclose case supporting elements extending over the case and radially outwardly from the case, as recited in **claim 1**. Furthermore, as the Chen reference is not within the field of the inventors' endeavor, nor reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicants were concerned, it is nonanalogous art. Therefore, **claim 1**, along with **claims 2-25** which depend therefrom, are patentable over Chen.

Booty, Jr. ("Booty") discloses a clock 10 including a front casing 12. Three arms 28 (case supporting elements) extend from the casing 12. Although Booty discloses arms extending from a casing, the reference fails to disclose arms extending over the casing and radially outwardly from the casing, as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, as the Booty reference is not within the field of the inventors' endeavor, nor reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicants were concerned, it is nonanalogous art. Therefore, claim 1, along with claims 2-25 which depend therefrom, are patentable over Booty.

Skop, Jr. et al. ("Skop") discloses a monitor calibrator 10 including a housing 12 and a suction cup 14 (case supporting elements). King et al. ("King") discloses a vacuum tool fixture including attachment devices 14 (e.g., suction cups) (case supporting elements) connected to a body 12. Neither Skop nor King discloses, or is concerned with, case supporting elements 30 extending over the case 10 and radially outwardly from the case 10, as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, as the King reference is not within the field of the inventors' endeavor, nor reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicants

were concerned, it is nonanalogous art. Consequently, a person of ordinary skill in the art of monitor calibrators would not look to King.

For the reasons discussed above, **claim 1**, along with **claims 2-25** which depend therefrom, are patentable over the combination of Skop and King.

New claim 26 recites cross sections of a plurality of case supporting elements form respective channels. None of Boles, Chen, Booty, Skop, or King discloses, or is concerned with, cross sections of supporting elements including channels. Therefore, claim 26, along with claims 27-30 which depend therefrom, are patentable over Boles, Chen, Booty, Skop, and King either taken alone or in any combination.

New claim 31 recites a plurality of case supporting elements extending across a case and originating at a central point on the case. None of Boles, Chen, Booty, Skop, or King discloses, or is concerned with, case supporting elements that extend across a case and originate at a central point on the case. Therefore, claim 31 is patentable over Boles, Chen, Booty, Skop, and King either taken alone or in any combination.

Amendment Dated June 13, 2003 Reply to Office Action of March 13, 2003

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that **claims 1-31** of the present application are in condition for allowance. Early notice thereof is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

CALFEE, HALTER & GRISWOLD LLP

Brian E. Kondas

Reg. No. 40,685

Customer No. 24024

(216) 622-8308